



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of 'Billingsgate,' it is justifiable for us to consider it to be the word of man rather than the inspired outpourings of the Almighty."

This is a matter of opinion. It is beyond our province or that of Dr. Inman to make such a generalisation. We think we have now said sufficient to give our readers some idea of the scope and object of this most important and interesting work. We know of no modern work which is more interesting to the student of historical anthropology than the one now before us. Dr. Innian is one of the men of the time, or perhaps more correctly, one of the men of the future. His work we commend to the attention of the students of theological and philological mythology.

Having examined the names explained in the vocabulary, we find that they may be thus classified. Those which refer to God as the almighty, inscrutable, omniscient, and omnipotent; those which refer to the sun as His minister; those which refer to the moon; to the heavens; to the planets; those which refer to the lingam chiefly; those which refer to the yoni; those which evidence an adoration of El; of Jah; of Shaddai; of Adonai; of Baal; of Bel, Asher, Gad (the Phœnician Venus), Astarte, and a variety of other names given to the Supreme. We must also notice an important note in which Dr. Inman, (on the authority of the Rev. Dr. Ginsburg, whose dictum on this subject carries overwhelming weight,) states that the Jews, in comparatively modern times, have intentionally altered the text of their Scriptures with the definite intention to make what is called the sacred record and the inspired word of God square with Hebrew ideas. In this the ancient "people of God" resemble the moderns, who assume the power of suppressing or altering the sense of any passage which they dislike. The God who changes not is thus declared to have two minds—the one announced in the Old, the other in the New Testament. The first is in reality regarded as the result of "His prentice hand," the second of His maturer judgment.

---

#### BARNARD DAVIS ON CRANIOSCOPY.\*

---

THE long expected volume which contains a catalogue of the author's magnificent collection of skulls is now published; and it behoves the student of anthropological science to give some notice to the large

\* *Thesaurus Craniorum*. Catalogue of the Skulls of the various Races of Men in the Collection of J. Barnard Davis, M.D., F.S.A., Membre Assoc. Etrang. Anthropol. Soc. Paris, Moscow, and Spain; V.-P.A.S.L., etc., etc. London: printed for the subscribers, 1867. 8vo, pp. xvii, 374.

series of interesting facts which Dr. Davis has now published to the world.

Shelton, in Staffordshire, is heard of to the English traveller as a *terra incognita*. There are few amongst the voyagers who watch that foretaste of Pandemonium, called the Potteries, as they rapidly cross the fields which present successive fiery volcanoes of blast furnaces, that know, or would care to know, that the largest collection of skulls in the world is in their immediate vicinity. Since the year 1848, Dr. Barnard Davis has, at his own expense (aided, in one case, by a grant from the British Association for the Advancement of Science), formed a collection of more than 1,540 human skulls, preserving, in each case possible, records of the race, sex, probable age, condition (as *e. g.* whether a "calvarium," a "calvaria," or a "cranium,") even of the principal measurements, and a short description. These are embodied in the work before us. The collection is founded, in part, on a number of skulls which belonged to a notorious phrenologist, named Deville, of the Strand, and comprises donations and purchases from the majority of private travellers and collectors. We regret that so superb a collection should be buried at Shelton. So long as it is preserved in so out-of-the-way a locality, so long will many English cranioscopists be debarred from inspecting it in detail. It is necessary to centralise our national collections of crania. The Royal College of Surgeons' collection is now practically useless for any purposes of scientific comparison, inasmuch as the order in which Prof. Owen left the museum in 1856, is now neglected; and there appears to be no convenient interleaved catalogue now extant, accessible to students in the public room, containing descriptions of the numerous additional crania collected since his time. Whether such a catalogue is ever to appear, even as an appendix to the long-expected *Crania Typica* of Prof. Busk, we know not; and in the meanwhile we wait. The British Museum collection is nearly as inconvenient to study as that of Lincoln's Inn Fields; and has the extra disadvantage of being composed of skulls filthy with dust, and in a dark cellar. To our certain knowledge, many months at a time pass over without this collection being consulted, although many of its specimens, *e. g.*, the Sacrificios skulls, the Australians, and the Etruscans, are of the greatest interest. The museum of the Anthropological Society of London contains, we believe, more than 190 skulls, one or two of which are almost unique in interest. The "Australian," presented by Dr. Canton, is, according to the opinion of one of the greatest anatomists of France, one of the lowest human skulls ever depicted. The negro skulls presented by Messrs. Dendy and Harris, are most typical of the West African negro. Such gems as the "Louth" skull are of the highest importance in

defining the limits of what has been called Neanderthaloid variation in the Celtic race ; whilst the "Hova" and the "Armenian" present examples which cannot easily be matched in any scientific collection. We regret that no descriptive catalogue of this collection has yet been published ; and that the Council have not yet been able to carry out their intention of having a proper exhibition case for these skulls, the expense of which would comparatively not be very great. It might be even advisable that the special subscription which some years ago was opened for museum and library purchases, should be revived ; and thus individual liberality on the part of the members would supply the great need which now exists for the proper and cleanly exhibition of this magnificent collection.

We take the following figures from Dr. Barnard Davis, as showing the relative number of crania in the principal European collections at the dates affixed to them. Of course, the estimate is purely approximate. The Galerie Anthropologique in the Jardin des Plantes, and the Museum of the Anthropological Society of Paris, are, we see, not included, as no catalogues are yet published. Still, some definite ideas are conveyed by the following figures :—

Name.	Describer.	Number.	Date.
Shelton.	J. Barnard Davis.	1540	1867
"Mortonian."	J. Aitken Meigs.	1045	1857
Netley.	G. Williamson.	601	1857
Moscow.	Professor Bogdanoff.	400	1867
St. Petersburg.	Von Baer.	355	1858
"Blumenbachian."	Wagner.	310	1856
Royal College of Surgeons.	Professor Owen.	266	1853
Leiden.	Van der Hoeven.	171	1860
British Museum.	Gray and Gerrard.	139	1862
Senkenbergian.	Lucae.	96	1860

To these should be added—

Anthrop. Society of London.	Undescribed.	191	1868
-----------------------------	--------------	-----	------

From this it appears that Dr. Barnard Davis's collection is much the largest in the world ; and that this catalogue is therefore, with its elaborate measurements, its precise facts, and its stern logic of vast comparison, a work which, next to the *Recherches sur la Craniométrie*, of Dr. Pruner Bey, must, to an important extent, mould anthropological thought. Dr. Davis believes that "it will serve to prove, or to confirm the proof, if confirmation be required, of the great value and importance of craniology, and also of the diversity of the origin of man, and in this way to reduce the former to legitimate scientific dimensions, and to help in delivering anthropology from the A B C condition in which it has long been arrested." Dr. Davis might have added, by the phrenologists and ethnologists of the type of the late amiable Dr.

Hodgkin. Dr. Barnard Davis, we see, appears as a strong collector of evidence in favour of the plurality of the human race, and in powerful antagonism to the Darwinian monogenists, whose belief, we are instructed, complies with the requisites of advanced science and Mosaic theology. Dr. B. Davis's facts certainly prove a great range of variation in the form of the skull ; and so far partially bear out the theory of polygeny. Of course, the question of unity or plurality will long remain the stock subject of dispute between anthropologists.

Hoc iudex sibi postulat probari.

It has been so much mixed up with the lower sort of theological speculation, that cautious *savans* rather "fight shy" of the topic. Monogeny is undoubtedly the favourite doctrine with the Darwinites, the British Association, and the female sex ; whilst too large a section of anthropologists appear to reason in the following manner :—1. "St. Paul says, 'Who has made of one blood all races of men,' etc." [which, perhaps, he does not say.] 2. "White men are white, negroes black, and in America is the 'red man ;' I know nothing more about the distinctions between any of these, but can see Chinese are not like Irishmen." 3. ["Happy thought," worthy of Mr. F. C. Burnand.] "Let us play at polygeny." And they have played at polygeny *usque ad nauseam*, without throwing the slightest light on the facts on which a theory can alone be proved. It is surely better even to be a disciple of the cautious monogenistic school of Waitz, than thus to clog the wheels of science with speculations which, in the nature of things, can never be demonstratively proved. The late Dr. Knox never pledged himself either to monogeny or polygeny. Hints he dropped in some of his later writings which rather seemed to indicate that his creed might be formulated as digenism, the light and dark races of man being vehemently contrasted. We must apologise, however, for quoting Dr. Knox. Anthropology in 1868 is not in a state to appreciate the generalisations of the far-seeing, truth-seeking Nestor of our science. It is too much the fashion now to quote Knox by the whole paragraph, and too little the fashion to try and understand him. The art of easy and facile employment of "scissors and paste" is too common now, and we can distinctly imagine the satirical shrug of contempt with which the old master would have listened to the lucubrations of some of his modern quoters and admirers. We remember when we conveyed the news of Dr. Knox's death to one then, in 1863, studying elementary anthropology, but whose brazen voice has since rang through Europe on the Darwinian side, that the "rising man" said of the dead lion "Oh, it does not so much matter." We go farther still, and say it is a good thing that Robert Knox is taken away from this world of small and selfish thinkers.

But the epigram we have already quoted reminds us that—

“Non de vi neque cæde, nec veneno,  
Sed lis est mihi, de tribus capellis.”

and we therefore return to our sheep.

The early British skulls, described by Dr. Davis, are for the most part identical with those figured and described in his magnificent work *Crania Britannica*, and the wood-cuts are the same as those already known to craniographers. One of the Anglo-Saxon skulls (260) presents features which Dr. Davis is inclined to attribute to some influence operating during life and in infancy,” in opposition to the theory of Dr. Thurnam that it was posthumous. Dr. B. Davis considers it “clear that the distortion is artificial, and that it is likewise rendered more than probable that the Teutonic tribes at times adopted that very mode of deformation of the heads of their infants, which was practised by many American nations.” He further concludes that “the opinion that the greatly distorted crania found in Austria and Switzerland, and regarded by Retzius and Fitzinger as those of Avars, are really the relics of people of the soil, may now be considered to have received the confirmation anticipated.” The plate he gives on page thirty certainly seems to bear out this interpretation. We are not aware that Tacitus, or any ancient writer on the early Germans, gives any account of artificial deformation being practised by the Teutons; this objection, however, proves little, as we know from experience how difficult it is to get information from savages as to the ceremonies immediately after the birth of the young.

Another highly interesting skull is No. 317, a convict executed at Norfolk Island. The sutures are here almost wholly effaced, the sagittal and lambdoid not being traceable. “Such synostosis forms the basis of all the peculiarities of the cranium, and most likely also of those of the individual to whom it appertained . . . That his moral state was strongly controlled by his cephalic peculiarities there cannot be a doubt.” Dr. Davis proceeds to urge the permanent separation of such miserable persons, “not as criminals but as dangerous idiots.” Cylindrocephalus and scaphocephalus will thus become “Pleas of the Crown.”

With regard to the celebrated Hythe skulls, which were described by Dr. Knox sometime ago in the *Transactions of the Ethnological Society*, it is remarked their “brachycephalism, their size, and general forms impress the eye with a close resemblance to the skulls of modern Germans. This possibly indicates a purer Teutonic extraction for the men of Kent than for those of the other parts of England; still our Jute skulls are dolichocephalic.”

No. 992 is described as “a very regular platy- and dolichocephalic

calvarium, described by Deville as the skull of Dodsley the celebrated publisher. But Robert Dodsley died at the age of sixty-one; this is the calvarium of a more aged person, of at least eighty." A publisher's skull is indeed a treasure! We remember that one of the most apish skulls we have seen is that of the unfortunate Teuton, General Würmser, in the Gall collection, at Paris; but a publisher's skull ought, in the year 1868, to be endowed with all the imaginary beauties of Blumenbach's Caucasian.

The celebrated Neanderthaloid skull (No. 1029) is figured, and Dr. B. Davis actually takes the trouble to reprint his note condemnatory of the opinions and annihilating the facts of Professor Huxley. Dr. Davis has already circulated this note sufficiently amongst English *savants*, and can say in the words of Professor Huxley (preface to Dally's translation of *Man's Place in Nature*, p. vi.): *La polémique est close, tous les anatomistes loyaux et compétents se sont depuis longtemps déclarés en ma faveur.*" This is not a time for Dr. Davis "thrice to slay the slain," or to attempt to pour water upon the murine that has already long been asphyxiated. We hope to hear no more of the Neanderthal skull, at least on this side of purgatory.

No. 1025 is the calvarium of an Irishwoman "found in a peat bog, county Wicklow, greatly shrunk and entirely converted into leather." The same conditions are also presented by No. 680.

Two Etruscan and one Oscan skull are in this collection, the cephalic indices of the two former being .83 and .80, and of the latter .79. The great tendency to brachycephalism of these early Italian races has been often urged by Dr. Pruner-Bey, who although he may perhaps exaggerate his theories, is entitled to the credit of being the first who actually *proved* the brachycephaly of the early Italian races. The subsequent researches of Nicolucci and others have placed that on a firm basis, which Pruner-Bey had only sketched out.

Many instances of the "derde gewrichtsknobbel" (*Condylus tertius*) are cited by Dr. B. Davis, the most interesting perhaps being the skull 1050, an Italian, which presents an articular surface on the point of the accessory condyle, which has articulated with the processus dentatus of the epistropheus.

There are twelve Swedish skulls in the collection; their average cephalic index is .75. All are dolichocephalic. In nine Lapp skulls the average is .80. Retzius gave .86 as the average of sixteen genuine Lapp skulls. We believe that the researches undertaken by Dr. Hunt, and which we hope to see soon published, indicate an extremely wide range of brachycephaly, and even of brachistocephaly, amongst the Norwegians. Dr. B. Davis does not seem to possess any Norwegian skulls. A Dalecarlian has .75, and an "old Norseman" from Lough Larne C. Antrim .73 as the cranial index.

Thirteen Veddah skulls, from Ceylon, are in this collection, a larger amount than we believe exists elsewhere, as well as twelve Cingalese. These are of great interest.

The Affghan skulls (six in number), "do not afford craniological support to the Jewish origin of this turbulent race." The whole part of the present work relating to the characteristics of the skulls of the various Jewish races is most interesting, comprising as it does an enormous series of skulls from every part of Judea. Our space, however, precludes a minute analysis of this work. We perceive that Dr. Davis is in strong opposition to Professor Owen with regard to the resemblance alleged by the latter to prevail between the Nepâlese skulls and those of the lower graveyard skulls of Great Britain. We transcribe Dr. Davis's argument :—

"The limitations of the Mongolian forms, and the variations they manifest in the different races in which they prevail, are not at present understood. It is possible that the crania yet to be enumerated in this catalogue may serve materially to increase information upon these points. The differences upon which their distinction rests are anatomical, yet deserve more to be regarded as diversities of proportion than as true organic differences. Still, they are not the less important or the less deserving of accurate discrimination. The differences between man and the anthropoid apes may also be viewed as merely differences of proportion. Hence, until the notions of those who have schooled themselves to regard such diversities to be owing to secondary causes merely, and to be unessential, are established, the differences of proportion which distinguish the skulls of the various races of men are fit subjects for minute study and deserving of high estimation ; for it may safely be said, with them are intimately connected every gradation of structure and function between the lowest savage and the highest European. Professor Owen maintains with great force and justice, yet it seems scarcely in conformity with his own principles, that the modifications of form and size which distinguish man from the anthropoid apes, are 'structures peculiar to, and characteristic of, human kind.' He does not consider his position to be invalidated when it is shown that the anthropoid apes have similar structures but of different proportions. With the same propriety it may be said that the conformation and features of the sub-Himalayan skull are peculiar to and characteristic of the aboriginal races found there. The argument is the same in both cases, and if valid in the one, must be so in the other."

The African skulls in this collection are of great interest. Dr. Davis contributes a most valuable note on the variety of the modes of torturing the incisor teeth, either as tribal marks, from caprice, or from fashion. He wonders that, "the chippings and filings practised on the



teeth of African tribes are much more superficial than those of the people of the Indian Archipelago, among whom the erosions frequently denude the dentine, and even pass through it to the pulp cavity."

The series of skulls for North and South America is of the greatest importance; at the same time, with regard to all skulls from Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, we would warn Dr. Davis, as well as other writers on the subject, that Mr. Squier, of New York, has in preparation a series of known facts for publication, which will overturn some of the rash theories as to the antiquities and Ethnology of South America. There is no subject on which the sciolist, or the pretender, can so easily generalise. A deceased and eminent anatomist used to be fond of saying, "If a man prove himself mentally incapable to study any branch of biological science with profit to himself or readers, let him write on ethnology." This may or may not be severe, but if it is true, South America affords a vast field for the exercise of the imaginative faculty. *En passant*, before Mr. Squier altogether clears out this Augean stable, we notice that Dr. B. Davis administers a severe *coup de grâce* to Dr. Daniel Wilson, with regard to Peruvian skulls on page 247.

The Australian skulls here described are especially noticeable for the resemblance which some of them, especially those from the Adelaide tribe (fig. 79, p. 259), bear to Prof. Huxley's Neanderthaloid river-bed types. That there is a certain rough resemblance between some river-bed skulls and some Australians is indubitable. That anything herein is shown but the demonstration of Meigs's law of homoiokephalic representation we deny.

Dr. Davis's intimate connection with Dutch Anthropology has enabled his correspondents at Batavia to supply him with many most interesting skulls from Polynesia, amongst others one a Fatean (figured by him in his memoir on the peculiar crania of the inhabitants of certain groups of islands in the Western Pacific, pl. ii, fig. 1 and 2), "a remarkably and exceptionally low prognathous skull, with inordinately large mouth and jaws; in its general form closely resembling the elongated distorted crania of the early Peruvians, but without any artificial deformation. The alisphenoids are wholly excluded from the parietals. The most pithecoïd cranium in the collection. The very *beau idéal* of the skull of a savage." The plate referred to of this skull certainly shows one which resembles closely some of those figured by Vogt, in his late magnificent Memoir on Microcephaly; but we are sorry to see in Dr. Davis' controversial note on this skull, a severe and unmerited criticism on Prof. Owen's words, "prognathism is probably concomitant with late weaning of the infant." This, Dr. Davis seems to imagine, means that the late weaning

of the infant produces prognathism ; his dread of " Darwinism, &c.," seems to have led him to forget to take down his " Johnson's Dictionary," which would have told him that concomitant meant " conjoined with, concurrent with, coming and going with, as collateral, *not causative or consequential*." Such a slight precaution might have induced him not to pen the superfluous note on his 312th page.

Such a trifling defect as this, however, does not seriously detract from the merits of this magnificent contribution to anthropological literature. The valuable tables at the end, and the general spirit of honest inquiry, critical thought, and careful and learned erudition, all tend to render this work one of the most useful in the hands of all who study the manifold and various diversities of crania in the races of man.

C. C. B.

## ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY.

A Letter from JOSEPH BARNARD DAVIS, M.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., V.-P.A.S.L.

SIR,—During the late discussion of an amalgamation of the two London Societies for the study of the science of man, which seems to be so desirable and natural, and so likely to be beneficial to all those who take an interest in this study, and would relieve country members like myself from the necessity of paying two subscriptions instead of one, I was particularly struck with the warmth and tenacity manifested for the retention of mere names.

The science has acquired the denomination of *Anthropology* in every part of the continent, in America, and in Britain. There are now Anthropological Societies in Paris, in Moscow, in Madrid, in New York, as well as in London, and also in Manchester. There is a Professor of Anthropology attached to the Jardin des Plantes, who has written a most elaborate report on the progress of anthropology. There is an *Anthropological Review* published in Germany, as well as one in London. And the term anthropology has become too extensively diffused, being understood as the proper name of a distinct new science, so fashionable or popular, that there is no hope of altering it. Whether rightly or wrongly, the science will inevitably for the future be called anthropology, whether we take it in good part or not. Perceiving this, and regarding names for no more than they are worth, I was rather surprised to find some of the more accomplished of its cultivators carried away by their feelings, and condemning the term as if it could not be tolerated. I was told by one friend, who ap-